

IN THE DRAWINGS

Applicants enclose Replacement Sheets for Figs. 1 and 2 with improved character line quality.

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Applicants amend claims 1 and 20 for clarification, and refer to Fig. 5B and its corresponding description in the specification for an exemplary embodiment of and support for the claimed invention. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action dated November 6, 2002, the Examiner included a Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review wherein the draftsperson objected to Figs. 1 and 2 for poor line quality. Applicants enclose Replacement Sheets for Figs. 1 and 2 that include improved line quality, with the Replacement Sheet for Fig. 1 reflecting Applicants' changes to Fig. 1 by Amendment filed on February 5, 2003. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate acceptance of the drawings.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 4-15 and the finding that claims 2 and 16-17 contain allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit that, as demonstrated below, base claim 1 is patentable over the reference cited against it. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner also allow claims 2 and 16-17, which depend from claim 1.

The Examiner objected to claim 20 for an apparent informality. Applicants amend claim 20 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

Claims 1 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,381,233 to Sunaga; and claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sunaga in view of U.S. Patent 6,307,850 to Watanabe. Applicants amend

claims 1 and 20 in a good faith effort to clarify the invention, and respectfully traverse the rejection.

Sunaga describes a spread spectrum technique for CDMA communication. The Examiner relied upon the description of a path detector 11 and despreaders 8 and 10, as illustrated in Fig. 2, in Sunaga as alleged disclosure of the features recited in rejected claims 1 and 18-20. The receiver illustrated in Fig. 2 of Sunaga only demodulates a signal in the same one channel being received over multiple paths because outputs of the despreaders are RAKE-combined, by RAKE combiner 12. Thus, the receiver is unable to receive a plurality of signals transmitted in respectively different channels. In other words, the technique relied upon by the Examiner, as described in Sunaga, merely receives a signal of a particular channel—and, i.e., spread code—propagated via multiple paths—for example, a direct wave and one or more reflection waves produced under a multi-path environment.

Thus, Sunaga, as cited and relied upon by the Examiner, does not disclose,

“[a] receiving device for receiving spread signals which are respectively transmitted over a plurality of channels, in a CDMA communication, comprising:

a path detector, which is used in a time-division manner so as to generate timing signals for the plurality of channels, for generating a timing signal, in each of a time interval, corresponding to each of the plurality of channels according to a correlation between received spread signals, which are spread with different spread codes, and a spread code corresponding to each of the plurality of channels; and

a plurality of despread demodulators, which are arranged for the plurality of channels, for respectively demodulating a corresponding spread signal among the spread signals according to one of the timing signals generated by said path detector,” as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added)

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Sunaga for at least the foregoing reasons. Claims 18-20 incorporate features that correspond to those of claim

1 cited above, and are, therefore, patentable over Sunaga for at least the same reasons. The Examiner relied upon Watanabe to specifically address the additional features recited in dependent claim 3. As such, the combination of Watanabe would not cure the deficiency of Sunaga described above, even assuming, arguendo, that such a combination would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the claimed invention was made. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3 is patentable over the cited references for at least the foregoing reasons with respect to base claim 1, from which claim 3 depends.

The above statements on the disclosure in the cited references represent the present opinions of the undersigned attorney. The Examiner is respectfully requested to specifically indicate those portions of the respective reference that provide the basis for a view contrary to any of the above-stated opinions.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Dexter T. Chang
Reg. No. 44,071

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-6384
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Docket No.: FUJO 16.155 (100794-11211)
DTC:bf